

# CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

*A Christian Journal of Opinion*

## **A Khrushchev Visit to America?**

It is significant that Governor Harriman's suggestion that a possible summit meeting should be held in America has found increasing sympathy among our statesmen. Mr. Harriman's arguments are simple and persuasive.

Khrushchev is undoubtedly the ultimate authority in Russia, though he is obviously not another Stalin. Despite his great pragmatism in adjusting the Marxist dogmas to the realities of the Soviet realm, he looks at America through Marxist spectacles. He believes that the "common people" or the "working masses" have a different attitude toward foreign policy than the "ruling cliques." Only a trip to America would open his eyes to the comparative solidity of American opinion.

Mr. Harriman rightly believes that Khrushchev does not want war. The danger of a nuclear holocaust has long since been attributed to miscalculation rather than evil intent by one side or the other. The danger is that Khrushchev, whom Mr. Harriman regards as able, confident and "cocky," might miscalculate in pressing us on one or all of the critical points, believing that the reluctance of a democracy to undertake any war, particularly a nuclear one, would prompt us to give way under pressure. Actually the opposite danger exists: that intransigence by both sides might create an atmosphere of hysteria in which the terrible holocaust might begin. If Khrushchev's visit to America would contribute anything to the avoidance of this danger, he ought to be invited by all means.

Meanwhile we have had visits from two of his trusted lieutenants, Anastas Mikoyan and Frol Kozlov, the latter a typical post-revolutionary Soviet bureaucrat. One assumes that the visits have contributed something to changing the Russian image

of America. But, significantly, neither of the deputies seriously exchanged views with our officials. They merely repeated their boss's two dicta. The one is that the Russians will not yield on Berlin. The other is that everyone must work for peaceful coexistence and the avoidance of a nuclear holocaust. This rather shrewd Soviet line, together with a continued optimism about a possible agreement at the summit, is calculated to put the onus on us.

Nevertheless it is worth observing that neither side has yielded "an inch." The Russians demand a solution of the Berlin crisis that would guarantee a catastrophic loss of our prestige in Europe and ultimately a Communist or at least neutral Germany.

There are two points on which we might bargain, though we have not done so. The most obvious was suggested by General De Gaulle. It is that we recognize the present Oder-Neisse line of demarcation between Germany and Poland. It cannot be changed without a war, and its recognition might allay Polish fears, as well as be a bargaining point with the Russians.

The other bargaining possibility is more speculative. It is that we yield on the policy of arming Germany with nuclear weapons. George Kennan suggested this in his famous BBC Reith lectures. We cannot weaken our defenses too much, but there may be some merit in an arrangement that does not coordinate Germany with the nuclear defense, particularly since a prospective nuclear war seems more and more likely to be one of guided missiles. (Incidentally, the Russian superiority over us in guided missiles is one of the real hazards of the present situation. Experts tell us that the "missile gap" cannot be overcome until 1965.)

**Vol. XIX, No. 14, August 3, 1959 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy**

The possibility of removing the absolute deadlock between us and Russia is a different problem than the one that prompted Mr. Harriman to suggest a summit meeting here in order to instruct Khrushchev on the facts of American life. In the one case it is demanded that both we and the Russians become less intransigent. In the other case we are interested in giving the Russian Premier a more adequate picture of America.

Since Russia has an all-powerful oligarch, it is particularly necessary to dissolve the remnants of the original Marxist dogma about capitalism. It was relevant only to the cruel early days of industrialism and has ceased to be true in any of the Western democracies.

Equally important, the people of America must realize that Russia too is subject to historical change and that our picture of Russia, derived from Stalin's terrible despotism, is as erroneous as their picture of us. Russia is not a democracy and will not be for years to come. But the modern efficient industrial empire, which has surpassed us in guided missiles, is a more vital and dangerous competitor than the "backward" nation that Stalin dominated and brought by cruel steps up the first rungs of the ladder of a technical civilization.

Peaceful coexistence thus means both a willingness to bargain on difficult strategic points of conflict and a genuine effort to understand each other, to secure fair rather than distorted and outmoded pictures of the life of each nation.

R. N.

## FOR THEIR SAKE...AND OURS

A RECENT DISPATCH from Tokyo reported that physicians at the Government-operated hospital for treating victims of the atomic bomb in Hiroshima have decided to stop announcing further deaths resulting from that radioactive blast. Their reason was the adverse psychological effect of these continued announcements on the hope of recovery among the survivors.

The Hiroshima doctors are probably correct in their estimate of this situation. Figures released on August 6, 1958, the thirteenth anniversary of the first use of the atomic bomb, indicated that there were 90,000 persons presently living under the threat of death from the effects of the bombing. In recent years deaths from "atomic disease" have averaged sixty annually.

To live as one of these 90,000—constantly harassed by this threat, discriminated against in the

search for employment and in seeking a marital partner—resembles what might well be termed a "living hell." The removal of the continual torment of such reminders as these announcements can, for these people, only be good.

For the rest of us, particularly in the United States, perhaps their continuation is necessary. Even when they find their way only into minuscule dispatches tucked amidst the plethora of "important" news or virtually lost from sight among the ads in the back pages, they are grim reminders of our need for contrition in the face of our frightful act of fourteen years ago.

Our hospitality and care for the Hiroshima Maidens cannot take away the frightful memory that continues to shock the conscience of mankind. For their sake—yes—no more announcements. For ours, may we never forget.

W. H. C.

## A NEW STATEMENT OF FAITH

THE ADOPTION of the Statement of Faith of the new United Church of Christ (the union of the Congregational-Christian and Evangelical and Reformed denominations) was a very moving experience for those who were present (see page 120 for the full text). Here is a corporate witness to the center of the Christian Gospel in fresh language that speaks to the spiritual conditions of our time, that says the things that are most important to say without identifying them with doctrinal formulations that have less authority than the faith they are intended to express or to guard.

This statement is intended to be a testimony of faith rather than a test of orthodoxy. It will be imposed upon no one, but it is hoped that it will be used in worship in local churches and on many occasions when members of this communion meet together. If one is to try to tell those outside the church what Christianity really is, this Statement of Faith should be helpful.

The Statement of Faith is the work of a commission of thirty persons chosen from both of the uniting denominations. It included theologians, parish ministers and laymen. Never in the many hours of discussion was the commission divided in terms of the denominational backgrounds of the members; the only differences were matters of personal conviction, usually of emphasis. When the statement was presented to the constituency, first in journals and then at the meeting of the General Synod, there were many good criticisms but very few that were fundamental. The statement

provides evidence of a growing unity of faith in a constituency with different traditions. This constituency includes so many theologians with influence outside their own communions that it is probable that this declaration will receive a favorable response outside the United Church.

It is important to bear in mind that no one intends this statement to take the place of the historic creeds. It is a contemporary testimony to the faith expressed in those creeds. There are many who have difficulties with the creeds of the ancient church and of the Reformation who will be able to express their faith through this statement with less intellectual conflict.

In two respects we may see in this statement a bridge. It is a bridge so far as these two denominations are concerned, providing a basis for union far deeper than any of the constitutional arrange-

ments yet to be worked out. It is also a bridge between those who emphasize their debt to the revival of Protestant theology of the past few decades and those who emphasize their debt to the theology of liberalism. The former will find here a recital of the "deeds of God" that are the substance of the biblical faith. The latter will find here the attempt, which is an expression of its spirit of liberalism, to distinguish between the faith and doctrinal formulations of the faith.

Doctrinal formulations and even elaborations are still needed, but they are subordinate to the faith itself and are in part relative to the intellectual situation of a particular time and place. Doubtless this statement in what it selects for emphasis is also in part relative to our situation, but it intends to point to affirmations that are prior to doctrinal formulations.

J. C. B.

## American Catholicism: Grounds for Misgivings

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

**C**HRISTIANITY AND CRISIS proposes a "Protestant-Roman Catholic dialogue." It has been initiated by three admirable Catholic contributions, each of them able, informed and informative, candid yet irenic (June 8 issue).

In attempting a Protestant rejoinder, one discovers himself in acute inner tension. Shall he yield to the almost irresistible impulse to rejoice in the mere achievement of conversation, to search out agreements and to anticipate increasingly significant rapprochement? Or shall he respond to the insistence of all three Catholic participants upon the essentiality of utter frankness if the proposed dialogue is to have value and accept the uncongenial assignment to record unwelcome misgivings? Recognizing that no one, even if holding firmly to "the truth," can possibly embrace "the whole truth" within rigorous space limits, this article undertakes the second alternative.

First of all, the question must be raised of how far Catholic exponents of "liberal" interpretation of Protestant-Roman Catholic relations speak representatively, let alone authoritatively, for their church. If the counter-question be pressed—to what extent their opposite numbers among Protestants, e.g., the editors of *Christianity and Crisis*, speak in behalf of Protestantism—a vital difference must be noted. So far as can be discovered, "liberal"

Roman Catholics exert little if any influence upon the official and binding "line" of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, either in America or at Rome; indeed that "line" appears pointed in a steadily more reactionary rather than liberal direction. In contrast, liberal Protestants do exert substantial if minority influence upon the convictions and policies of their churches; indeed, positions that they may prophetically espouse today often become the official "line" tomorrow.

From this a corollary follows: in thinking of Roman Catholicism, non-Catholics cannot evade the obligation to distinguish always between the attitudes of liberal Catholics and the position of the Roman Catholic Church. Protestants are justified in rejoicing over the achievement of conversation, in searching out agreement and in anticipating further rapprochement with liberal Catholics. They are not entitled, however, to harbor the illusion that this reflects or forecasts a drawing together of the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches. Unfortunately this is a distinction that is too often blurred, an illusion that is too often cherished in precisely those Protestant circles, such as the constituency of this journal, which on most other issues do not permit themselves the luxury of sentimental and wishful thinking.

The current vogue among both liberal Catholics and liberal Protestants is to play down the gravity if not the reality of Church-State issues (where,

Dr. Van Dusen is a member of the Editorial Board. As a leader of the ecumenical movement, he has observed Roman Catholicism in many countries.



in fact, most of our tensions are focused), to argue that American Catholics have been grossly misrepresented if not caricatured and to join in flaying Protestants and Other Americans for Separation of Church and State as a convenient whipping boy.

### **The Ryan Thesis**

In appraising Roman Catholic policies on these issues, Protestants have often cited the position set forth by the distinguished Catholic scholar Father John A. Ryan in his authoritative writing on Church and State. That position is in substance: when Roman Catholics are a minority in any country or community, they are under obligation to conform to the prevailing law and practice with respect to religious liberty, the status and privileges of religious institutions, etc.; when Catholics are an effective majority, it is their duty to seek to bring law and practice into accord with Catholic principle, i.e., State and Church in intimate alliance under the guidance of the Church's leadership.

The present tendency is to discount Father Ryan as a spokesman for American Catholics. Undoubtedly he does not speak for many liberal Catholics. But that is not the issue. Does the position set forth faithfully reflect official Roman Catholic principle and policy? Protestants must assume that it does unless and until it is disavowed by higher authority.

While there have been reassuring statements by American bishops on the Catholic's loyalty to the Constitution, there has been, so far as I am aware, no assertion of alteration in ultimate guiding principle. Indeed, it is difficult to contemplate that there could be, since that principle is at the very heart of Catholic dogma. And, to the credit of Roman Catholicism, what matters at the end of the day is the Church's underlying theological position.

Nor is this a matter of dogmatic principle only. The position outlined is in fact Roman Catholic practice in virtually every country where loyal Catholics constitute a majority or effective plurality of the populace. Only one who has observed at first hand the actual situation in one or more of these "Catholic" countries can rightly appraise the normative consequences when the Catholic hierarchy is in a position to direct the influence of the Church toward bringing Church-State relations into accord with Roman Catholic principle.

Illustration need not be drawn from foreign countries only. It would be difficult to find a community in the United States where Roman Catholics constitute a majority or effective plurality of

the electorate in which non-Catholics are not continuously and deeply concerned over the character and extent of pressures exerted by the Church and its official spokesmen upon legislation and government. This concern is not confined to Protestants; it is often strongest among secularists. Indeed, it is important to stress that these issues do not pose merely a Protestant-Roman Catholic confrontation, but rather a source of tension between Catholics and their fellow-citizens.

Here, of course, is the crux of the "Catholic for President" issue. Senator Kennedy may have deliberately and convincingly disassociated himself from the traditional Catholic conception of a Catholic officeholder. If so, he is disowning Catholic practice in the state of his own rearing, (the Commonwealth of Massachusetts). More than that; he is disavowing in principle basic Catholic doctrine. In the event of the election of a Catholic to the Presidency, "political shrewdness" might, as Mr. O'Dea argues, restrain Catholic authorities from exerting upon this high office the types of persuasions and pressures that are all too familiar in state and local governments. But "political shrewdness" can be expected to exercise constraint only so long and so far as expediency dictates.

### **A Retrogressive, Reactionary Trend**

Protestants' most serious misgivings, however, arise from an even deeper and more disturbing fact—the dominant trend in official Roman Catholic thought. By general recognition, that trend has been increasingly retrogressive, indeed reactionary. The latest dogma, the "Assumption of the Virgin," is only the most recent illustration of a lengthening sequence of official papal or Vatican pronouncements that seem to Protestants more and more to flout responsible historical truth, to magnify the miraculous if not the magical and to steadily widen the gulf between Catholic and Protestant theologians. That many forward-looking Catholics regret this only renders the fact more painful as well as poignant.

When history passes definitive judgment upon the late Pope Pius XII, with due recognition of his great gifts, his saintly character and his lofty devotion to peace, it is almost certain to discover one of his mightiest influences to have been an accentuation of this reactionary trend in official Catholic theology. Pope John XXIII has shown engaging originality; it is doubtful whether he could possibly reverse, even if he wished to do so, the direction that has dominated the Church's thought for most of the past century.

Mr. Clancy has suggested that the watershed be-

tween Protestantism and Catholicism is in the relative importance they attach to goodness and truth. "Protestantism has tended . . . to give primacy to the will. . . . The Catholic, by self-definition, is a man who holds the truth." No; the far more decisive dividing line is *within* the province that the Catholic claims as his own—in the conception and conviction of truth.

Mr. Clancy further gives an engaging description of how difficult it is for a Catholic to imagine how a person of intelligence and integrity could ever be a Protestant. The latter may be permitted to respond in the precise obverse. For many Protestants, the final insoluble mystery is how their highly intelligent and patently sincere Catholic friends can possibly affirm their Catholic "truth," with its ever-enlarging insistence upon what, to Protestants, is incredible as well as unhistorical, typified but not exhausted by a steadily mounting Mariolatry.

Within that larger loyalty to the totality of Cath-

olic dogma, a stumbling-block with direct relevance and special aggravation for fellow-Americans is Catholic doctrine on the normative relations of the civil and ecclesiastical powers. In many ways it would be easier as well as more nearly in accord with fact if Protestantism and Roman Catholicism faced each other as two faiths, as each of them confronts Judaism.

Dialogue should further mutual understanding. It is often assumed that understanding will almost automatically advance collaboration and even unity. On the contrary, it may disclose deeper differences, broader chasms, higher obstacles. If the issues of tension between American Catholics and Protestants are explored in their full range and exposed in their wider context, especially if the foregoing interpretation of the dominant trend in official Roman Catholic theology is correct, this may well be a first result. Nevertheless, in the interest of truer understanding dialogue is hopefully to be pursued.

## The Dialogue Continued

CLAUD NELSON

CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN Protestants and Catholics, often a genuine dialogue, are going on in many places and at various levels. All who see promise in them must be grateful to the editors of *Christianity and Crisis* for their part in promoting them, and to the Roman Catholic writers who responded with both honesty and humility to the editors' recent invitation (June 8 issue). The subject matter, the procedures and the atmosphere of many recent conversations (held under auspices as varied as those of the Fund for the Republic, the Methodists, the Villanova Institute and the National Conference of Christians and Jews) witness to a maturing of our acceptance and understanding of the religiously pluralist character of society in the United States as a given from which much profit may be derived—if we do not spend too much time deploring it, or too much energy in trying to replace it overnight with some sort of uniformity.

Commenting on a recent commencement address by John Cogley, *America* reminds us that we have here a pluralism of a special kind. Our religious traditions are Judaic and Christian. The particular character of our pluralism should not affect our theories of religious liberty nor our civic tol-

eration where other faiths are involved, but it is a tremendous advantage for the dialogue. It also puts us in this country under special obligation to demonstrate the advantages of religious dialogue where it is relatively easy: how else can we recommend it where differences are more fundamental and more likely to breed violence?

### Aims of the Dialogue

What is the object of dialogue between Roman Catholics and Protestants? Surely it is not for the purpose of enrolling us all in a synthetic "American religion," though it ought to raise the level of the Americanism to which we aspire. It cannot be primarily to weld us into a more effective alliance against communism, though that too is a needed and legitimate by-product.

The dialogue should contribute to the formation of a Protestant position and a Protestant voice, so far as this is possible and desirable, and still more to the development of a Christian position and a Christian voice wherever needed. The Protestant process and the Christian process are interdependent, and neither must wait for the perfecting of the other. At some points the process within Protestantism is the more difficult. This is partly because of differing attitudes in regard to our relations with Catholicism. It is partly inherent in

Mr. Nelson has participated in the Protestant-Roman Catholic dialogue on many occasions, including a period when he worked with members of both churches in Italy.

the assumption of every Protestant that his is the essential Protestantism.

Let it be emphasized that the need for a united voice for many and important practical reasons is not the fundamental motive in our dialogue. But our total witness to each other and to the secular and non-Christian cultures is handicapped as long as our unity as Christians is obscured in our own and others' eyes. Not to engage in the dialogue is in effect to assume that the Holy Spirit no longer has anything to say to us. It is not enough that we talk in the somewhat rarified atmosphere of high-level groups having no official responsibility. The dialogue must take place in local communities and must deal with specifics as well as general relations.

Protestants must overcome their fearfulness and defensiveness and rely more on the affirmative elements in their characteristic witness. Instead of assuming that we have a monopolistic birthright in Americanism and are its beleaguered defenders, we need to have more confidence in the inherent appeal of anything that deserves that name. We give up nothing when we recognize and welcome the contribution of others.

If we believe in justice and have confidence in democracy, we must bring more to the dialogue than the "camel's nose" argument. Each point of tension is a challenge to the whole community to act in the general interest—not simply a tug-of-war between power blocs.

A friend long resident in Rome, a German monsignor, told me of the two areas in Germany that he knew most intimately. In Bavaria, he said, all are Catholics and none know why, though they are devout and obedient. In the Palatinate, Protestants and Catholics in approximately equal numbers live together as neighbors, discuss everything, including religion, and are better Christians and neighbors for it.

### **Areas for Dialogue**

Our dialogue must deal not only with the different ecclesiastical theories of Church-State relations, but with policy and practice at local, state and national levels. Is it good for democracy or for religion when either Protestants or Roman Catholics engage in public or private pressures on legislators, not on the basis of a strong ethical or moral position, but in order to gain a point in prestige or finances at the expense of the other? I mention this not to seek an apportionment of guilt, since there is enough to burden us all, but to urge self-searching dialogue.

Protestants have usually exercised their power spontaneously and un-selfconsciously, and they are often inept when they resort to pressures. In 1958 in New York, for example, they had a good cause in their plea for moderation in a Sunday closing bill, but they spoke ineffectively with three uncoordinated and partly contradictory recommendations to legislators. When Roman Catholics in Connecticut last year spoke on school bus transportation, the legislators had no doubt as to what was desired. The same was true when the New Jersey legislature recently passed a scholarship bill supposedly very much to the practical advantage of Roman Catholic institutions of higher learning.

Dialogue at every level will be required if we are to maintain adequate common schools and afford opportunity for the integration of religion with the rest of the curriculum. If each religious interest acts independently and at cross purposes, we may find ourselves with an unsatisfactory or even intolerable situation.

Roman Catholics complain of a double burden and of denials of distributive justice and religious liberty. Others accuse them of defeating measures for the improvement of the public schools, or of capturing them and transforming them into parochial schools. Community by community, we must work out by common consent and by experimenting some combination of resources that will not divorce religion from education but will give us more and better education for our money and will emphasize the assets rather than the liabilities of our religious pluralism. The experience of the churches in social welfare indicates that some accommodation on specifics is possible, even when our theory and tradition suggest it is unlikely.

From my experience I can see no insurmountable obstacles in the way of concerted action for the defense of religious liberty. A religious liberty counterpart of the ACLU, strongly supported by both Protestants and Catholics, would be more effective than present Protestant efforts, which receive only limited support. Furthermore issues might be more strategically chosen. There might be less pressure to concentrate on issues where Protestants seek to defend themselves against Roman Catholic pressures on the assumption that they are backed by a monolith. More attention could then be given to governmental and secularistic pressures inimical to all religion.

Within such a structure we might at least get a clear and fair statement of the issue when real controversy divides Protestants and Roman Catholics.



## PASSING PARADE

### THAT WORD "DISCRIMINATION"

Last year the Archbishop of Capetown, the Most Reverend Joost de Blank, visited New York. While here he was the guest preacher at one of Manhattan's fashionable Fifth Avenue churches.

The morning bulletin carried a few paragraphs of introduction including the statement that the Archbishop made clear his position on *apartheid* with the comment that as a Christian he was "color-blind." Also included was a quotation from his most recent book, *This is Conversion*.

"Christians cannot contract out of their civic and corporate responsibilities. As Christians they have to bring the whole of life into subjection to our Lord. The work of conversion will never be finished until all the kingdoms of the world publicly acknowledge that they have become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ."

In "The Rector's Column" on the back page of the same bulletin there was a discussion of the word "discrimination," which is here printed in full.

"IT'S TOO BAD that 'discrimination' has suddenly become a dirty word, unfit for polite society. One wonders how the ability to discriminate managed to wax so unrespectable. For the power of selectivity is one of man's noblest gifts. Without it, he falls beneath the beasts of the field.

"And to one degree or another, every soul under heaven uses this precious gift. Even the lowliest man in the gutter discriminates. The Bowery bum prefers to associate with a fellow-bum over a can of Sterno, rather than to take genteel sips of Harvey's Bristol Cream with the dowager empress of Fifth Avenue.

"Yet to be in favor of discrimination these days is like being in favor of sin. No one is a firmer foe of segregation, or a finer friend of integration than I. In a republic under God, every public institution should be equally open to all sorts and conditions of men—without respect to the shape of their eyes, the language of their tongues, or the pigmentation of their skins—at least as long as they comport themselves in a seemly manner.

"But discrimination has always held a valid place in the area of *private* choices. If a man's club is his castle, he and his peers have the inherent right to make the nice distinction as to who shall be invited to cross the castle's threshold. And if the individual has not been invited, it's bad taste to attempt the crossing.

"A *PRIVATE* club is a private club. And being exactly what it says it is, it has the moral and legal right—under its charter—to decide, for example, that membership shall be restricted to unicorns, mermaids and jabberwockies. Now this choice may reveal a rather peculiar use of the gift of discrimination. But that's the unicorns' business, not ours!

"All of which is why the recent furor over the Lake Placid Club is so puzzling. It seems that the New York State Mayors' Conference had been invited to hold its convention at the club. Everything

was going along according to Hoyle, when suddenly the arrangements split at the seams. New York's Mayor Wagner, among others, announced he would not attend, apparently because the club's private conduct was not indiscriminate.

"The Lake Placid Club, it is alleged, does not admit Jews to membership. Now here is where we've got to be careful to keep our facts straight. In scheduling this *public* convention, the club was inviting all the mayors of all the cities. They could be Zulus, Patagonians, Tierra del Fuegians or Mayflower descendants. The club couldn't care less.

"Only in its status as a *private* club might it decide not to invite into regular membership either the Zulu or the Mayflower descendant. All of which Mayor Wagner and his dissenting peers must have known before they signed up for the parley. Why, then, all the sudden furor? Could it be to encourage the support of a certain bloc of voters?

"The Mayor of Rochester summed it up nicely. Said he, 'What a private club does to limit its membership is its own business—although I personally might not like it. As long as there is no discrimination when it is operating as a *public* hostelry, the matter becomes academic.'

"Now *there's* a discriminating mayor!"

TWO OTHER VIEWS of discrimination have recently appeared and are printed below.

"Let me say immediately that I am not opposed to the idea of discrimination as such. A discriminating man is universally admired, and rightly so, precisely because he bases his judgment of people and things on *individual* merit. Indeed, what is needed is not absence of discrimination, but more discriminating discrimination. The fundamental objection which I have to color differentiation is that it is indiscriminate and blunt-edged. It works injustice to people who are as intelligent, good and worthy as any others, and coarsens the fiber of those who enforce it." (From "Cry the Divided Country" by Denis V. Cowen, *The New York Times Magazine*, May 17, 1959.)

"The word *discriminating*, as used here, is a *double-entendre*; the delicate meaning of the word is used to defend the indelicate function of the word. What is missing from the equation is the fact that true gentility, to say nothing of Christian morality, discerns human values which transcend superficial human differences. A discriminating Christian, in other words, will not discriminate against the Negro simply because he is a Negro. His good taste may properly exclude certain undesirable Negroes and whites from the intimate circles of home and friendship. This he may do without need for compunction. But his Christian sense of morality, if it is uncontaminated by spurious notions of propriety, will not permit and certainly should not be used to sanction the unjust exclusion of Negroes from those social areas for which they are qualified and to which they properly belong." (From Kyle Haselden's recently published *The Racial Problem in Christian Perspective*, New York, Harper & Brothers, pp. 54-55.)

## CHURCH NEWS AND NOTES

### Statement of Faith

*Adopted by the General Synod of the United Church of Christ; Oberlin, Ohio, July 8, 1959*

We believe in God, the Eternal Spirit, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and our Father, and to his deeds we testify:

He calls the worlds into being,  
creates man in his own image  
and sets before him the ways of life and death.  
He seeks in holy love to save all people from aimlessness and sin.

He judges men and nations by his righteous will declared through prophets and apostles.

In Jesus Christ, the man of Nazareth, our crucified and risen Lord,

he has come to us  
and shared our common lot,  
conquering sin and death  
and reconciling the world to himself.

He bestows upon us his Holy Spirit,  
creating and renewing the Church of Jesus Christ,  
binding in covenant faithful people of all ages,  
tongues, and races.

He calls us into his Church  
to accept the cost and joy of discipleship,  
to be his servants in the service of men,  
to proclaim the gospel to all the world  
and resist the powers of evil,  
to share in Christ's baptism and eat at his table,  
to join him in his passion and victory.

He promises to all who trust him  
forgiveness of sins and fullness of grace,  
courage in the struggle for justice and peace,  
his presence in trial and rejoicing,  
and eternal life in his kingdom which has no end.  
Blessing and honor, glory and power be unto him.  
Amen.

### Cardinal Cautions Kerala Catholics

Valerian Cardinal Gracias, Archbishop of Bombay, has cautioned Roman Catholics in Kerala that their refusal to open their schools in defiance of the Communist government's new education law may jeopardize democracy.

He urged them to "remember that the most serious issue in Kerala is that of tyranny versus freedom and that negligence and failure to use the rights given by democracy will only promote a

#### The Next Issue

of *Christianity and Crisis* will appear on September 21. This follows our usual procedure. The first fall number will be a special education issue.

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY  
BOOK RECEIVING DEPT  
5201 WOODWARD AVE  
DETROIT 2 MICH  
27462 11-59

rapid growth of dictatorship." However, he declared, "the intrusion of the state into areas of culture and private life must not be permitted."

Cardinal Gracias spoke at a special evening mass at Mount St. Mary's Basilica in Bandra, a Bombay suburb, attended by an estimated 10,000 Roman Catholics who walked eleven miles from four separate sections of the area in a "sympathy pilgrimage" for fellow-Roman Catholics in Kerala.

Cardinal Gracias vigorously denied Communist charges that the Church in Kerala is "engaging in politics. We must let the world know," he stressed, "that our mission is spiritual. But this would be meaningless if it were divorced from the temporal, if it did not have a background of intellectual and unbiased understanding of events as they occur from day to day."

*Ecumenical Press Service, Geneva*

## CORRESPONDENCE

### Mistaken Identification

TO THE EDITORS: Here at the Religion and Labor Council of America we look forward to receiving *Christianity and Crisis* as one of the truly thought-provoking journals of comment on the social scene. Presentation of . . . "Labor, Management and the McClellan Committee" (John A. Fitch, June 22) serves to give needed background and perspective in this important area. . . .

It was therefore . . . shocking to discover . . . the understandable but inexcusable identification (page 92) of the Textile Workers Union of America with corruption, rather than the United Textile Workers Union. The TWUA is known as a sound democratic union. . . .

CLAIR M. COOK  
Columbus, Ohio

## CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

*A Christian Journal of Opinion*  
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

### EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR and JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*  
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*

M. SEARLE BATES    WALDO BEACH    AMOS WILDER  
ROBERT McAFFEE BROWN    F. ERNEST JOHNSON  
JOSEPH SITTLER    HENRY P. VAN DUSEN  
RICHARD T. BAKER    J. OSCAR LEE  
KENNETH W. THOMPSON    WILLIAM LEE MILLER

### CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER    JOHN A. MACKAY  
FRANCIS P. MILLER    M. M. THOMAS  
JOHN BAILLIE    WILLIAM F. MAY    ROGER L. SHINN  
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

### CONTENTS

AMERICAN CATHOLICISM: GROUNDS FOR MISGIVINGS  
HENRY P. VAN DUSEN  
THE DIALOGUE CONTINUED  
CLAUD NELSON  
PASSING PARADE: THAT WORD "DISCRIMINATION"